MAY -6 2016

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION W. D. NOLEBRIDS PASTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6:15-mj-04.166-mmp

United States of America,	Case No. CR 16-mj-70581
Plaintiff,) v.)	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDINGTIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Loren Star Defendant.) White For the reasons stated by the parties on the reco	ord on $5/6$, 2016, the Court excludes , 2016 to $5/(2/16)$, 2016 and
finds that the ends of justice served by the contand the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S finding and bases this continuance on the follow	inuance outweigh the best interest of the public .C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this
Failure to grant a continuance would be See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
of defendants, the nature of the prosecut fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect add	ue to [check applicable reasons] the number ion, or the existence of novel questions of equate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	eny the defendant reasonable time to obtain e diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance would un counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(commitments, taking into account the exercise of
time necessary for effective preparation, taking See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	extending the time period under
DATED:	LAUREL BEELER United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendan	Assistant United States Attorney